

JUN 23 2008

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. YOR820030510US1

**REMARKS**

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of the presented claims are in condition for allowance.

**I. IN THE SPECIFICATION**

The Examiner notes that trademarks used in the Specification should be capitalized wherever they appear and accompanied by the appropriate generic terminology. In response, the Applicants have amended paragraphs [0049] and [0063] of the Specification to describe "the JAVA programming language." As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments requested by the Examiner have been addressed. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

**II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2, 4-15, 17-27, AND 29-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-15, 17-27, and 29-31 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Grindrod patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,868,413, issued March 15, 2005, hereinafter referred to as "Grindrod") in view of the Sluiman et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,590,589, issued July 8, 2003, hereinafter "Sluiman"). In response, the Applicants have amended independent claim 1 in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention. Claims 10, 14-15, 17-27, and 29-31 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants do not concede that the subject matter encompassed by claims 10, 14-15, 17-27, and 29-31 is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner; rather, claims 10, 14-15, 17-27, and 29-31 were cancelled solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the pending claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by cancelled claims 10, 14-15, 17-27, and 29-31 and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications. The remainder of the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the fact that Grindrod and Sluiman, singly or in any permissible combination, fail to teach or suggest the novel

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. YOR920030510US1

invention of enabling customization of a rule-based application in a deployment environment, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 1.

By contrast, the cited portions of Grindrod at most teach that business rules may be customized at design time. In other words, Grindrod teaches a method for customizing business rules prior to use in a deployment environment. For instance, Grindrod teaches that a customized business rule is preferably not enabled "until all requisite information has been defined" (Grindrod, column 10, lines 27-31). This would seem to suggest that a business rule cannot be altered or customized while it is enabled (*i.e.*, deployed in a runtime environment).

The portion of Grindrod that the Examiner cites to illustrate the teaching of customization in a deployment or run-time environment (*i.e.*, column 7, lines 39-44) merely describes various user interfaces for authoring business rules. This passage says nothing about using these user interfaces to customize business rules in a deployment environment. Moreover, nowhere else in Grindrod is it taught or suggested that customization of a business rule is enabled in a deployment environment, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 1.

Likewise, Sluiman also fails to teach or suggest customizing a rule-based application in a deployment environment, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 1. Thus, Grindrod in view of Sluiman fails to teach or suggest enabling customization of a rule-based application in a deployment environment, as recited by Applicants' claim 1. Specifically, Applicants' claim 1 positively recites:

1. A method of customizing a rule-based application, the method comprising:  
designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template,  
the customizable element being selected by an end-user;  
compiling said customizable element into at least one object to form a  
ruleset;

parsing said set to detect said customizable element designated as a  
customizable template; and

enabling customization of said rule-based application in a deployment  
environment. (Emphasis added)

## PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. YOR920030510US1

Since Grindrod and Sluiman both fail to teach or suggest enabling customization of a rule-based application in a deployment environment, Grindrod in view of Sluiman does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claim 1. Moreover, dependent claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and recite additional features. As such, and for at least the exact same reason set forth above, the Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 are also not obvious and are allowable.

Therefore, Applicants contend that claims 1-2, 4-9, and 11-13 are patentable over Grindrod in view of Sluiman and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-9, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

### III. NEW CLAIM

The Applicants have added new independent claim 32. In addition to several other limitations, claim 32 recites the limitation of enabling customization of a rule-based application in a deployment environment. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claim 32 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

### IV. CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of the presented claims fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the maintenance of the final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. YOR920030510US1

Respectfully submitted,

6/23/08

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

  
Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,400  
(732) 530-9404